



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/955,397	09/18/2001	Jaime A. Siegel	SNY-R4757	1207
24337 7590 01/21/2009 MILLER PATENT SERVICES 2500 DOCKERY LANE RALEIGH, NC 27606				
EXAMINER WINTER, JOHN M				
ART UNIT 3685		PAPER NUMBER		
MAIL DATE 01/21/2009		DELIVERY MODE PAPER		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/955,397

Applicant(s)

SIEGEL ET AL.

Examiner

JOHN M. WINTER

Art Unit

3685

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 25 September 2008.
2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 38-43, 45, 46, 48-54, 56-62, 72-79 and 84-105 is/are pending in the application.
4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
6) ☒ Claim(s) 38-43, 45, 46, 48-54, 56-62, 72-79 and 84-105 is/are rejected.
7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
5) ☐ ~~Notes of Informal Patent Application~~
6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Acknowledgements

The Applicants amendment filed on September 25, 2008 is hereby acknowledged, Claims 38-43, 45, 46, 48-54, 56-62, 72-79, and 84-105 remain pending .

Response to Arguments

1. The Applicant states that there is no teaching, suggestion, motivation or articulated reasoning presented within the Office Action for "presenting the customer with an opportunity to complete a transaction to acquire additional rights to a selected portion of the A/V content".

The Examiner responds that the language "to complete a transaction to acquire additional rights" is not a postive claim limitation; regarding conditional or optional language the MPEP is clear, language that suggest or makes optional but does not require steps to be performed or does not limit a claim to a particular structure does not limit the scope of a claim or claim limitation (MPEP 2106, II, C; *Intel Corp. v. Int'l Trade Comm'n*, 20 USPQ2d 1161 (Fed. Cir. 1991); *In re Johnston*, 77 USPQ2d 1788 (CA FC 2006)).

Further more the Examiner notes that the Digital Works Rights language as disclosed by figure 15 of Stefik discloses multiple processes for managing access to content including a "metered rate" and "fee per use" the Examiner contends that paying a fee to use the content anticipates the claimed feature of "presenting the customer with an opportunity to complete a transaction to acquire additional rights to a selected portion of the A/V content"

The Applicant states that any proposed combination of the cited references lacks the claimed features “associated with selection of a portion of an item of A/V content for which rights have already been obtained, obtaining rights therefor, and storage of same.”

The Examiner states that Stefik discloses the claimed feature as per figures 11 and 18, In Figure 18, Stefik discloses a process for requesting content associated with a set of digital rights, in figure 11 Stefik discloses the storage structure of rights attached to a document.

In response to Applicant's argument that there is no suggestion to combine the references, the Examiner recognizes that references cannot be arbitrarily combined and that there must be some reason why one skilled in the art would be motivated to make the proposed combination of primary and secondary references. In re Nomiya, 184 USPQ 607 (CCPA 1975). However, there is no requirement that a motivation to make the modification be expressly articulated. KSR International Co. v. Teleflex Inc., 82 USPQ2d 1385 (U.S. 2007). The test for combining references is what the combination of disclosures taken as a whole would suggest to one of ordinary skill in the art. In re McLaughlin, 170 USPQ 209 (CCPA 1971). references are evaluated by what they suggest to one versed in the art, rather than by their specific disclosures. In re Bozek, 163 USPQ 545 (CCPA) 1969

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

2. Claims 38-43,45,46,48-54, 56-62, 72-79, 84-105 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as

being unpatentable over Garfinkle (US Patent 5,530,754 in view of Stefik (US

Patent 5,715,403).

3. As per claim 38,

Garfinkle ('754) A method of delivering digital content, comprising:

receiving a request from a customer for transfer of A/V content in digital form to the

customer; receiving payment from the customer for the transfer of the A/V content in

accordance with a first usage rule; transferring audio/video content in digital form from a

content provider to the customer in accordance with the first usage rule, the digital form

of the A/V content comprising at least an audio portion and a video portion; (Column 3,

lines 19-43; and Column 3 line 54 -- column 4 line 11; Figure 5)

wherein the selected portion comprises at least one of a soundtrack, a documentary

segment, art interview, an audio segment, a video segment and a still image;

wherein the customer is presented with the opportunity in a menu displayed at least just

prior to, during or just tier presentation of the full selection of AV content; and

enabling the customer to store the selected portion if the customer elects to complete the

transaction. (Column 3, lines 19-43; and Column 3 line 54 -- column 4 line 11; Figure 5)

associated with selection of a portion of an item of A/V content for which rights have already been obtained, obtaining rights therefor, and storage of same. (Figures 11 and 18).

Garfinkle ('754) does not explicitly disclose providing limited usage rights to the AN content to the customer; presenting the customer with an opportunity to complete a transaction to acquire additional, rights to a selected portion of the A/V content. Stefik ('403) discloses providing limited usage rights to the AN content to the customer; presenting the customer with an opportunity to complete a transaction to acquire additional, rights to a selected portion of the A/V content (Figure 15). It would be obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the Garfinkle ('754) method with the Stefik ('403) method since the combination of these elements does not alter their respective functions, the combination would have yielded predictable results to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention.

Claims 46, 48, 62, 72, 79, 84, 94 and 103 and 104-105 are not patentably distinct from claim 38 and are rejected for at least the same reasons.

4. As per claim 39,

Garfinkle ('754) discloses the method according to claim 38,

Garfinkle ('754) discloses the claimed invention except for "second usage rule", It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use a second usage rule, since it has been held that mere

duplication of the essential working parts of a device involves only routine skill in the art.
St Regis Paper Co. v. Bemis Co., 193 USPQ 8.

5. As per claim 40,

Garfinkle ('754) discloses the method according to claim 39,
wherein the transaction comprises one off a purchase of unlimited rights to play the
selected portion, a purchase of rights to play the selected portion for a designated period
of time, and a purchase of rights to play the selected portion a designated number of
times. (Column 3,
lines 19-43; and lines 54-63)

Claim 51 is in parallel with claim 40 and is rejected for at least the same reasons.

6. As per claim 41,

Garfinkle ('754) discloses the method according to claim 38,
wherein the A/V content further comprises a table of contents portion (TOC) that indexes
the selected portion. (Column 3, lines 54-62)

7. Claims 52, 58 and 78 are in parallel with claim 41 and are rejected for at least the same
reasons

8. As per claim 42,

Garfinkle ('754) discloses the method according to claim 38,

Garfinkle ('754) does not explicitly disclose the presenting and enabling take place within a designated period of time defined by the first usage rule. Stefik ('403) discloses the presenting and enabling take place within a designated period of time defined by the first usage rule (Figure 15). It would be obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the Garfinkle ('754) method with the Stefik ('403) method since the combination of these elements does not alter their respective functions, the combination would have yielded predictable results to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention..

9. Claims 53, 77 and 102 are in parallel with claim 42 and are rejected for at least the same reasons

10. As per claim 43,

Garfinkle ('754) discloses the method according to claim 38, wherein the A/V content comprises one of a motion picture, a television program, a documentary and a music video. (Abstract)

11. Claim 54 is in parallel with claim 49 and is rejected for at least the same reasons.

12. As per claim 45,

Garfinkle ('754) discloses the method according to claim 38, wherein the transferring comprises one of downloading the A/V content as one or more digital files, streaming the A/V content, and transmitting the A/V content as a real time transmission. (Abstract, Figure 5)

13. Claims 56, 75, 92 and 101 are in parallel with claim 45 and are rejected for at least the same reasons

14. As per claim 49,

Garfinkle ('754) discloses the method according to claim 48,

Garfinkle ('754) does not explicitly disclose the storing comprises receiving a key code from the content provider to permit storing the selected portion. Stefik ('403) discloses the storing comprises receiving a key code from the content provider to permit storing the selected portion. (Figure 15). It would be obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the Garfinkle ('754) method with the Stefik ('403) method since the combination of these elements does not alter their respective functions, the combination would have yielded predictable results to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention

15. Claims 87 and 96 are in parallel with claim 49 and are rejected for at least the same reasons

16. As per claim 50,

Garfinkle ('754) discloses the method according to claim 48,

wherein the storing comprises receiving a download from the content provider. (Abstract)

Claim 100 is in parallel with claim 50 and is rejected for at least the same reasons.

17. As per claim 57,

Garfinkle ('754) discloses the method according to claim 48, Garfinkle ('754) does not explicitly disclose the digital rights to the selected portion is associated with a usage rule that defines rights to limitations on a number of copies of the selected portion that can be made. Stefik ('403) discloses the digital rights to the selected portion is associated with a usage rule that defines rights to limitations on a number of copies of the selected portion that can be made.

(Figure 15). It would be obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the Garfinkle ('754) method with the Stefik ('403) method since the combination of these elements does not alter their respective functions, the combination would have yielded predictable results to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention..

18. Claims 89 and 98 are in parallel with claim 57 and are rejected for at least the same reasons.

19. As per claim 59

Garfinkle ('754) discloses the method according to claim 48, wherein the digital form of the A/V content is associated with a usage rule. (Column 3, lines 19-43; and lines 54-63)

20. Claim 76 is in parallel with claim 59 and is rejected for at least the same reasons.

21. As per claim 60

Garfinkle ('754) discloses the method according to claim 59,

wherein the request to acquire digital rights to the selected portion is sent before the usage rule expires. (Column 3,

22. lines 19-43; and lines 54-63)

23. As per claim 61

Garfinkle ('754) discloses the method according to claim 48,

wherein the menu has a menu selection for acquiring digital rights to the selected portion.

(Column 3, lines 19-43; and lines 54-63)

24. Claims 90 and 99 are in parallel with claim 61 and are rejected for at least the same reasons.

25. As per claim 73,

Garfinkle ('754) discloses the method according to claim 72,

wherein the transaction comprises purchasing the selected portion of the AN content.

(Column 3, line 66- Column 4, line 9)

26. As per claim 74,

Garfinkle ('754) discloses the method according to claim 73,

wherein the purchase secures usage rights to Store the selected portion distinct from the

A/V content. (Column 4, lines 13-34)

27. As per claim 85,

Garfinkle ('754) discloses the apparatus according to claim 84,
wherein the A/V content is stored as one or more digital files. (Abstract)

Claims 91 and 95 are in parallel with claim 85 and are rejected for at least the
same reasons.

(a) As per claim 86

Garfinkle ('754) discloses the apparatus according to claim 84,
wherein the TOC is stored as one or more digital files. (Abstract)

28. As per claim 88

Garfinkle ('754) discloses the apparatus according to claim 84,
wherein the transaction comprises receiving a payment from the customer; and permitting
the customer to store the selected portion in accordance with a usage role. (Column 3,
line 66- Column 4, line 9), (Column 4, lines 13-34)

29. As per claim 93

Garfinkle ('754) discloses the apparatus according to claim 84,
|wherein fine transaction comprises one of: a purchase of unlimited rights to play the
selected portion, a purchase of rights to play the selected portion for a designated period
of time, and a purchase of rights to play the selected portion a designated number of

times. (Column 3, line 66- Column 4, line 9)

30. As per claim 97

Garfinkle (*754) discloses the apparatus according to claim 94, wherein the transaction comprises sending a payment; and storing the selected portion in accordance with a usage rule. (Column 3, line 66- Column 4, line 9), (Column 4, lines 13-34)

Conclusion

31. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to JOHN M. WINTER whose telephone number is (571)272-6713. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 8:30-6, 1st Fridays off.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Calvin Hewitt can be reached on (571) 272-6709. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

JMW

/Calvin L Hewitt II/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 3685